

REMARKS

Claims 1-17, 28-40, 43, 44 and 51-53 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 28, 43, 44, 51, 52 and 53 are amended. Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-17, 28-40, 43, 44 and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,856) in view of Ho (U.S. Patent No. 6,398,556). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, neither Lee nor Ho, individually or in combination, disclose, teach or even suggest an education training management system including at least a computer for use in training management includes aggregate storing device that aggregates the received lecture information and stores an aggregate result, and recognition device, connected to the aggregate storing device, that recognizes whether an access is received from the manager of the trainee or not, and selectively provides the lecture information of the trainee who is managed by the manager from the lecture information of a plurality of trainees to the terminal for the manager via the communication line based on the recognition result, and the terminal for a manager includes reading device that can read the lecture information by accessing the computer for use in training management via the communication line, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 28, 43, 44, 51, 52 and 53.

Instead, Lee discloses an educational method and system for executing the method, to improve the efficiency of individual learning by monitoring the student's progress and pacing the course material to the student's ability to comprehend and learn. See, Abstract of Lee. Specifically, Lee discloses in Fig. 2 and in the disclosure that a teacher's workstation 40 stores homework answers of the students in the database files in the hard drive of the teacher's workstation 40. The teacher initializes the system and then the students enter their

homework assignments from the previous day into the system. The homework assignment can be entered manually by the student typing the answers on the keyboard. Alternatively, an optical scanning device can be provided which is used to scan the homework paper and digitize the answer. In either case, the homework answers are compared to the expected answers by the CPU of each station and the results transmitted via the LAN to the teacher's workstation. The homework answers are stored in database files corresponding to each student name or ID number in the hard drive at the teacher's station for future use. See, for example, col. 5, lines 1-18. Still differently, Lee merely discloses that the teacher's workstation stores the homework answers of the students.

As such, Lee fails to disclose or suggest a computer that selectively provides the lecture information of the trainee who is managed by the manager from the lecture information of a plurality of trainees to the terminal for the manager via the communication line based on the recognition result, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 28, 43, 44, 51, 52 and 53.

Ho fails to compensate for the above-noted deficiencies of Lee. Specifically, Ho discloses a computer-aided learning method apparatus for a learning user to learn materials inexpensively. See, Abstract of Ho. Specifically, Ho discloses in Fig. 2 and in the disclosure that information tracked can be provided to the updater 214 to update information regarding the user. This user profile can be updated by such information such as, for example, if he is strong in fixing engines, such information is stored in his user profile. In another example, institute users are allowed to access such information. A determinator 204 can allow access to information regarding a learning user by using a query engine 212 to query information regarding the learning user. See col. 6, line 54 to col. 7, line 8.

As such, Ho does not disclose, teach or even suggest the computer selectively provides the lecture information the trainee who is managed by the manager from the lecture

information of a plurality of trainees to the terminal for the manager via the communication line based on the recognition result.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 28, 43, 44, 51, 52 and 53 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-17 and 29-40 depend from independent claims, and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17, 28-40, 43, 44, 51, 52 and 53 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

MAC:YSC/ccs

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Information Disclosure Statement

Date: July 25, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
